

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**  
8

9 LAMARR ROWELL,

10 Petitioner,

11 vs.

12 JACK PALMER, et al.,

13 Respondents.  
14

Case No. 3:10-CV-00135-LRH-(VPC)

**ORDER**

15 Petitioner has submitted an amended petition (#31). The court has reviewed it pursuant to  
16 Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts. The court  
17 will dismiss four grounds and direct respondents to respond to the remaining ground.

18 The court dismissed petitioner's pro se grounds 1, 3, 4, and 5 because they lacked merit.  
19 Orders (#4, #27). Petitioner, now represented by counsel, re-alleges grounds 1, 3, 4, and 5 to  
20 preserve them for possible appellate review. The court dismisses them for the reasons given in its  
21 earlier orders (#4, #27).

22 Ground 2 remains. Petitioner has divided it into four parts. Respondents need to respond to  
23 all four parts.

24 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that grounds 1, 3, 4, and 5 of the amended petition (#31)  
25 are **DISMISSED**.

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondents shall have forty-five (45) days from the date  
2 of entry of this order to answer or otherwise respond to the first amended petition (#31). If  
3 respondents file and serve an answer, then they shall comply with Rule 5 of the Rules Governing  
4 Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, and then petitioner shall have forty-five  
5 (45) days from the date on which the answer is served to file a reply.

6 DATED this 20th day of June, 2011.

7 

8  
9  
10 LARRY R. HICKS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28